UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,790	01/16/2004	William J. Beyda	2000 P 09085 US 01	8157
Elsa Keller	7590 01/06/200	EXAMINER		
Siemens Corpor		ANWAH, OLISA		
Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Iselin, NJ 08830	0	2614		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/759,790	BEYDA, WILLIAM 、	J.
Examiner	Art Unit	

	OLISA ANWAIT	2014	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra time of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	TE below);	
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	**	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a convergence NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alleged non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate,		_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>15-19 and 21-25</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-14 and 20</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	1 6 11 1 6 6 6 11 N	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application ir	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12 Note the attached Information Displacure Statement(s)	DTO/SP/09) Donor No(a)		
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li> <li>13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Olisa Anwah/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2614	

### Continuation of 13. Other:

#### Argument:

A remotely transferred number is not itself used to call back the message leaving party.

#### Response

Because the number at the Callback Number register is used by the PBX to transfer the call to the calling party and because the Callback Number register is remote from the PBX, Goldman teaches the remotely transferred number is used to call back the message leaving party.

## Araument:

The Patent Office does not address the applicant's claim for transferring to a separate call control system local to the remote party.

#### Response:

- 1. The PBX is the same as the separate call control system.
- 2. The transferring to a separate call control system occurs when the ANI number is transferred from Callback Number register 80 to the PBX.
- 3. The PBX is local to the subscriber; therefore, the separate call control system is local to the remote party.

## Argument:

In Goldman there is no remote caller whatsoever.

#### Response:

4. The subscriber is physically remote from unit 46; hence, the subscriber is a remote caller.

### Argument:

Applicant's claim explicitly recite first and second call control systems, at least one of which is remote. The PTO's rejection completely ignores this recitation.

## Response:

- 5. Unit 46 from Figure 6 is the same as the claimed first call control system.
- 6. The combination of units 102, 105, 108 and 25 from Figure 6 is the same as the claimed second call control system.
- 7. Unit 46 is remote from the subscriber; and so, this reads on the claimed feature of at least one of which is remote.

## Argument:

Goldman contains one and only one call control system.

#### Response:

8. As argued supra, unit 46 from Figure 6 is the same as the claimed first call control system while the combination of units 102, 105, 108 and 25 from Figure 6 is the same as the claimed second call control system. Consequently, in Goldman there are multiple call control systems.